



## REMARKS

Each of the issues raised in the August 23, 2005 Office Action will be addressed in the order they appear.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Examiner correctly identified a typographical error in claim 8 as amended.

Claim 8 has been amended through the enclosed amendment to address this informality.

### Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-10, 12 and 17-20 were rejected as being anticipated by Taylor, US Pat. No. 5,976,171. Taylor shows double hinged arms (Fig. 13B). At least one of these arms is movable relative to a longitudinally extending rack 312 through a housing 322. First segment 330a, 330b as identified in the office action as well as middle segment 360 extend longitudinally from rack 312. First pivot 331 is aligned with second pivot 363 as shown in Figure 13B.

Through the enclosed amendment, the applicant has attempted, once again, to distinguish the structure of Taylor. The third segment, along with the second pivot, of the applicant's structure is now claimed to be laterally displaced relative to the first pivot toward the other arm. This is not statement of intended use, but a functional limitation. The applicant is not contemplating rotation of rotatable housings (as can be done for some of the claims) to achieve this lateral displacement, but is envisioning this feature as illustrated by the embodiment in the position (now claimed as a first position in some of the claims) as shown in Figure 5 as originally filed. The second pivot is laterally closer to the opposing arm than the first pivot as characterized by a lateral displacement, or a lateral offset.

The applicant appreciates the Examiner illustrating the rotational capability of Figure 16 of Taylor to achieve the claimed limitations as this was not understood by the Applicant. The applicant still does not understand how the "Y" or yoke of the middle segment of Figure 13B could be said to laterally offset the third segment to the first segment as was claimed, but believes that by claiming the lateral displacement of the appropriate pivots along with the appropriate third segments, the claimed lateral displacement is not a claimed element, and not a statement of intended use which appears to overcome the cited prior art. The applicant believes the new language clarifies the claimed language to distinguish it from the Taylor reference, but would certainly appreciate any assistance the Examiner would offer since the two structures have very different appearances.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2005

By: 

Stephen J. Stark  
Attorney for Applicant  
MILLER & MARTIN LLP  
Suite 1000 Volunteer Building  
832 Georgia Avenue  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402  
(423) 756.6600



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop ~~RCE~~ **No 606**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of November, 2005.

By: Beverly L. Middleton  
Beverly L. Middleton